

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/482,843	01/13/2000	Marcus Peinado	MSFT-0103/127334.6	7584
41505	7590 04/11/2005		EXAM	INER
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP			SMITH, JEFFREY A	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3625	
			DATE MAILED: 04/11/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/482,843	PEINADO ET AL.
Exammer-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeffrey A. Smith	3625
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Jeffrey A. Smith</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Steve Meyer</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 6 April 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 101		
Claims discussed: 121		
Prior art documents discussed: NONE		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		•
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate a directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate a did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writtorecord of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Jefriley A./Smith Frimary Examiner		
/		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner indicated that prosecution was being re-opened at least because the previous Office action raised a rejection under 35 USC 101 for the first time and such rejection was not necessitated by any amendment by Applicant. Accordingly, the finality of the previous Office action was premature. No further response is due by Applicant and a communication by the Office will follow in due course.